



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/764,486	01/09/2001	Kari T. Teraslinna	05043P011	6169
8791	7590	08/24/2005	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			SALAD, ABDULLAHI ELM	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2157	

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/764,486	TERASLINNA, KARI T.	
	Examiner Salad E. Abdullahi	Art Unit 2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-11, 13-14 and 16-21 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 12 and 15 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____ .

Response

1. Applicant's remarks filed on 6/13/2005 with respect to claims 1-22 have been fully considered but are not persuasive for the following reasons.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 12 and 15 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

2. Applicant alleges neither of the references teaches a "remote logical port".

Examiner respectfully disagrees because Virtual trunking discloses using one single physical port, customers need the ability to "logically bundle" their network trunks, including a remote logical port (RLP) model to model a remote physical port (RPP) (see page 7, fig. 6, lines 1-15).

Applicant further alleges in Vuppala, there is no flow manager. Examiner asserts the control procedure (see page 643, lines 16-18 and page 642, col. 2, paragraph 3) is the flow manager.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vuppala et al., Layer-3 Switching Virtual Network Port: An Inter-network Switching Framework [hereinafter Vuppala], in view of Virtual Trunking and Traffic Shaping on BPX 8600 Series(Cisco Systems white paper)[hereinafter Virtual Trunking].

As to claim 1, Vuppala discloses an apparatus (see fig. 1, the PNPacketHandler) comprising:

a flow manager (control procedure) (see page 643, lines 16-18 and page 642, col. 2, paragraph 3);

a trunk scheduler (packet scheduler) to schedule transmission units direct to the remote physical port (see page 646, col. 2, paragraph 4, lines 1-13).

Vuppala, is silent regarding:

a remote logical port (RLP) model to model a remote physical port (RPP).

Virtual Trunking, discloses using one single physical port, customers need the ability to "logically bundle" their network trunks, including a remote logical port (RLP) model to model a remote physical port (RPP) (see page 7 , fig. 6, lines 1-15 and). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Virtual Trunking into Vuppala, thus providing high bandwidth connection with increased QoS.

As to claim 2, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the flow manager comprises: a flow shaper (see page 646, col. 2, paragraph 4, lines 1-13); and

a flow parameter database (see page 648, lines 3-4).

As to claim 3, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the flow manager comprises: a discard policy that is able to differentiate between the discard rates of at least two flows (see page 643, paragraph 2); and a flow parameter database (see page 648, lines 3-4).

As to claim 4, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the flow manager comprises: an RLP scheduler (see page 646, paragraph 4); and a flow parameter database (see page 648, lines 3-4).

As to claim 5, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the RLP model comprises:

an RLP data structure to hold data indicating characteristics of the RPP(see page 648, lines 3-4); and

an RLP traffic shaper to make a transmission unit eligible consistent with the characteristics of the RPP (see page 646, paragraphs 3 and 4).

As per claim 6, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 4 wherein the flow manager comprises a plurality of queues, one queue for each flow directed toward the RPP(see page 646, col. 2, paragraph 4, lines 1-13).

As to claim 7, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 5 wherein the flow

manager comprises a plurality of queues, one queue for each flow directed toward the RPP (see 643, column 2, paragraph 2).

As to claim 8, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 7 wherein shaping and scheduling are performed by manipulating pointers to the queues (see page 646, column 2 paragraphs 3 and 4).

As to claim 9, Vuppala disclose the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the trunk scheduler statistically multiplexes an aggregate of the flows directed to a plurality of RPPs (see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 3).

As to claim 10, Vuppala discloses the apparatus of claim 1 wherein the trunk scheduler operates in a weighted round robin non-work conserving manner (see page 646, column 2, paragraph 4).

As per claim 10, Virtual Trunking discloses the apparatus of claim 1, further comprising one of an OC-3 port and a DS-3 port (see page 1, line 9).

As to claim 11, Vuppala discloses a system comprising:
a broadband communication link (see fig. 1);
a demultiplexer (VPN PacketHandler, Node N1) coupled to a plurality of physical ports and the broadband communication link (see page 643, column 2, paragraph 2); and

a network element Node N2) coupled to the communication link, (see page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3) .

Vuppala, is silent regarding: the network element modeling the plurality of physical ports and providing a two-tier hierarchy of shaping and scheduling of flows directed to the plurality of physical ports link .

Virtual Trunking, discloses using one single physical port, customers need the ability to "logically bundle" their network trunks, including a remote logical port (RLP) model to model a remote physical port (RPP) (see page 7 , fig. 6, lines 1-15 and). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Virtual Trunking into Vuppala, thus providing high bandwidth connection with increased QoS.

As to claim 13, Virtual Trunking discloses the system of claim 12 further comprising: a plurality of data structures (table) populated with data indicating characteristics of a remote physical port (RPP)) (see page 7 , fig. 6, lines 1-15). and

a database populated with flow parameters (see page 642, column 2, paragraph 4 to page 643, column 1, lines 1-29 and page 648, column 1, lines 3-4).

As to claim 14, Virtual Trunking discloses the system of claim 14 wherein a one-to-one correspondence exists between RLP data structures and RPPs) (see page 7 , fig. 6, and lines 1-15).

As to claim 16, Vuppala disclose a method comprising:

(see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3); and

reflecting quality of service from a control aggregator to the plurality of RPPs (see page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3).

Vuppala, is silent regarding: the modeling a plurality of remote physical ports (RPP) as a plurality of remote logical ports (RLP).

Virtual Trunking, discloses using one single physical port, customers need the ability to "logically bundle" their network trunks, including a remote logical port (RLP) model to model a remote physical port (RPP) (see page 7 , fig. 6, lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teaching of Virtual Trunking into Vuppala, thus providing high bandwidth connection with increased QoS.

As to claim 17, Vuppala discloses the method of claim 17 wherein reflecting comprises: shaping a plurality of flows directed to a RPP into a plurality of shaped flows (see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3);

scheduling the shaped flow into a scheduled flow(see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3);

shaping the scheduled flow into a shaped scheduled flow (see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3); and

scheduling the shaped scheduled flow for transmission to the RPP(see fig. 1 and page 643, column 2, paragraph 2 and page 646, column 2, paragraphs 2 and 3).

As to claim 18, Vuppala discloses the method of claim 17 wherein modeling comprises: populating a database with an entry indicating an ability of an RPP to transmit data(see page 642, column 2, paragraph 4 to page 643, column 1, lines 1-29 and page 648, column 1, lines 3-4).

As to claim 19, Vuppala discloses the method of claim 19 wherein modeling further comprises: creating a data structure for each flow directed to a remote physical port (see page 642, column 2, paragraph 4 to page 643, column 1, lines 1-29 and page 648, column 1, lines 3-4);and manipulating the data structure to indicate eligibility of a transmission unit consistent with the ability of the RPP to transmit data(see page 642, column 2, paragraph 4 to page 643, column 1, lines 1-29 and page 648, column 1, lines 3-4).

As to claim 20, Virtual Trunking discloses the method of claim 17 further comprising: statistically multiplexing the flows from the plurality of RLPs to the plurality of RPPs) (see page 7 , fig. 6, lines 1-15).

As to claim 21, Virtual Trunking discloses the method of claim 17 wherein a one-to-one correspondence exists between the RLPs and the RPPs) (see page 7 , fig. 6, and lines 1-15).

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Salad E Abdullahi whose telephone number is 571-272-4009. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 - 5:00. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-5268**.

8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Abdullahi Salad
Examiner AU 2157
3/6/2005